

ALJ to take further evidence, and the ALJ may make new or modified findings of fact and may modify the initial decision based on that new evidence. These new or modified findings of fact are likewise conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(Authority: 5 U.S.C. 557(b); 20 U.S.C. 1221e-3, 1234(f)(1), 1234a(d), and 3474(a))

[58 FR 43474, Aug. 16, 1993, as amended at 60 FR 46494, Sept. 6, 1995]

§81.44 Final decision of the Department.

(a) The ALJ's initial decision becomes the final decision of the Department 60 days after the recipient receives the ALJ's decision unless the Secretary modifies, sets aside, or remands the decision during the 60-day period.

(b) If the Secretary modifies or sets aside the ALJ's initial decision, a copy of the Secretary's decision is sent by the Office of Hearings and Appeals to the parties by certified mail, return receipt requested. The Secretary's decision becomes the final decision of the Department on the date the recipient receives the Secretary's decision.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1221e-3, 1234(f)(1), 1234a(g), and 3474(a))

[54 FR 19512, May 5, 1989. Redesignated and amended at 58 FR 43473, 43474, Aug. 16, 1993]

§81.45 Collection of claims.

(a) An authorized Departmental official collects a claim established under this subpart by using the standards and procedures in 34 CFR part 30.

(b) A claim established under this subpart may be collected—

(1) 30 days after a recipient receives notice of a disallowance decision if the recipient fails to file an acceptable application for review under §81.37; or

(2) On the date of the final decision of the Department under §81.44 if the recipient obtains review of a disallowance decision.

(c) The Department takes no collection action pending judicial review of a final decision of the Department under section 458 of GEPA.

(d) If a recipient obtains review of a disallowance decision under §81.38, the Department does not collect interest on the claim for the period between the

date of the disallowance decision and the date of the final decision of the Department under §81.44.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1234(f)(1); 1234a(f)(1) and (2), (i), and (1))

[54 FR 19512, May 5, 1989. Redesignated and amended at 58 FR 43473, Aug. 16, 1993]

APPENDIX TO PART 81—ILLUSTRATIONS OF PROPORTIONALITY

(1) *Ineligible beneficiaries.* A State uses 15 percent of its grant to meet the special educational needs of children who were migratory, but who have not migrated for more than five years as a Federal program statute requires for eligibility to participate in the program. Result: Recovery of 15 percent of the grant—all program funds spent for the benefit of those children. Although the services were authorized, the children were not eligible to receive them.

(2) *Ineligible beneficiaries.* A Federal program designed to meet the special educational needs of gifted and talented children requires that at least 80 percent of the children served in any project must be identified as gifted or talented. A local educational agency (LEA) conducts a project in which 76 students are identified as gifted or talented and 24 are not. The project was designed and implemented to meet the special educational needs of gifted and talented students. Result: The LEA must return five percent of the project costs. The LEA provided authorized services for a project in which the 76 target students had to constitute at least 80 percent of the total. Thus, the maximum number of non-target students permitted was 19. Project costs relating to the remaining five students must be returned.

(3) *Ineligible beneficiaries.* Same as the example in paragraph (2), except that only 15 percent of the children were identified as gifted or talented. On the basis of the low percentage of these children and other evidence, the authorized Departmental official finds that the project as a whole did not address their special educational needs and was outside the purpose of the statute. Result: The LEA must return its entire award. The difference between the required percentage of gifted and talented children and the percentage actually enrolled is so substantial that, if consistent with other evidence, the official may reasonably conclude the entire grant was misused.

(4) *Ineligible beneficiaries.* Same as the example in paragraph (2), except that 60 percent of the children were identified as gifted or talented, and it is not clear whether the project was designed or implemented to meet the special educational needs of these children. Result: If it is determined that the project was designed and implemented to serve their special educational needs, the